

January 12, 2006
Case No. 8125/4
Serial No.: 10/716,094
Filed: November 18, 2003
Page 2 of 3

REMARKS

In the Provisional Election Office Action, Examiner Datskovskly subjected claims 1-20 to a restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C. §121 with Invention I consisting of claims 1-18, which are directed to a computer serving cart, and Invention II consisting of claims 19 and 20, which directed to power shredding circuit. The Applicant hereby provisionally elects Invention I for further prosecution by Examiner Datskovskly, and respectfully traverses the restriction requirement as being improper because Invention I and Invention II are not independent as respectfully asserted by Examiner Datskovskly. Specifically, the Applicant respectfully asserts that scope of claims 1-18 of Invention I encompasses a computer service cart having embodiments employing the power shredding circuit of Invention II as recited in dependent claims 9 and 18.

Withdrawal of the restriction requirement of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §121 is therefore respectfully requested.

January 12, 2006
Case No. 8125/4
Serial No.: 10/716,094
Filed: November 18, 2003
Page 3 of 3

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-20 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested.

Dated: December 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,
William Baker



CARDINAL LAW GROUP
Suite 2000
1603 Orrington Avenue
Evanston, Illinois 60201
Phone: (847) 905-7111
Fax: (847) 905-7113

Darrin Wesley Harris
Registration No. 40,636
Attorney for Applicant

*** TRANSMISSION ERROR REPORT ***

JAN 12,2006 23:17	Model #	Lexmark X6100 Series	3175980430
START TIME	SENT TO	PAGES	RESULT
23:16	18479057113	0	NO ANSWER